

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,929	08/27/2003	Yoshinobu Mukai	13425.39US01	4112
7590 03/28/2006			EXAMINER	
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON P.C. P.O. Box 2902-0902			ARTHUR JEANGLAUD, GERTRUDE	
Minneapolis, MN 55402		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
• ′		•	3661	_

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/648,929	MUKAI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gertrude Arthur-Jeanglaude	3661
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
<ul> <li>1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Ja</li> <li>2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This</li> <li>3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ul>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1 and 7 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 7 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2003 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	vn from consideration.  relection requirement.  r. a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected arrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected arrawing(s) is objected arrawing(s) is objected arrawing(s).	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/9/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/648,929

Art Unit: 3661

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

At line 7 of claim 1, it is unclear whether the memory referred to is meant to be the ROM or the memory cited at line 2.

Claim 7 is also rejected for incorporating the deficiencies of its base claim.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao (U.S. Patent No. 5, 917, 405)

As to claim 1, Joao discloses a control apparatus and method for vehicle and comprising an electric power steering device comprising a memory (161, 162) which is accommodated in the electric power steering control device mounted on a vehicle (See col. 1, lines 30-40; col. 2, lines 4-20), and which permits rewrite and storage of data (Fig. 4 #151,161,162; wherein transmitting a signal (Figs. 7, 8; col. 3, lines 13-28) from an external of the vehicle allows the data stored in the memory to be rewritten; and a

ROM (See Fig. 4 which stores map data for a plurality of different vehicles wherein the memory (See col. 5, lines 19-64); though the prior art does not specifically disclose the ROM stores a plurality of map data, it is obvious to store a plurality of map data from a database or the ROM and to store label information such street location for guidance (See col. 5, lines 25-31; col. 7, lines 21-36).

### REMARKS

Claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than functions. In re Danly, 120 USPQ 528, 531

Apparatus claims cover what a device is not what a device does. Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch &Lomb Inc., 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528.

As set forth in MPEP \$ 2115, a recitation in a claim to the material or article worked upon does not serve to limit an apparatus claim

As recited in claim 1, the ROM with clauses: "which stores", "read out at a startup" "by selection of", "stores label information" are functions and do not diffentiate from the memory of the prior art.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art fails to disclose selecting an address where the selected map data on the ROM is stored based on the label information and copying a set of constants or mathematical expression data from the ROM to the memory.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gertrude Arthur-Jeanglaude whose telephone number is

(571) 272-6954. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30

a.m. to 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**GAJ** 

March 22, 2006

rude A Leanslaule DE A. JEANGLAUDE

Page 4

PRIMARY EXAMINE